

LIBERALITY TOWARDS THE UNFORTUNATE.

Under Democratic rule, the eleemosynary institutions of the State have likewise grown with the public demand. Four great asylums, equipped according to the best modern scientific knowledge, furnish hospitals for those mentally afflicted and homes for the incurably insane. A school for the feeble minded has been founded, where, by careful training and special attention, many of those unfortunates who otherwise would be a charge upon the community, are prepared to take their places in the various walks of life. Reform schools for both boys and girls have been provided, that the youthful offender, for whom there is still hope, may not be confined with the hardened criminal. The penitentiary, under Republican rule a charge upon the taxpayer of the State, has been made practically self-supporting.

Not only has democracy built up these great institutions, but the interests of the people have been fostered by wise and beneficent laws passed under Democratic administrations.

SPECIFIC LAWS IN BEHALF OF LABOR.

No state in the union has more carefully or conscientiously sought to improve the conditions of the laboring man than Democratic Missouri. Child labor has been prohibited. The hard rule of the English common law that prevented the injured party from recovering compensation where the negligence was that of a fellow servant has been modified to meet the changed conditions of modern civilization. The inspection of mine and factory gives greater security to life and improves the conditions under which so many of our fellow men must work. Inspection of food and boards of health are improving the conditions under which we live. The inspection of banks, building and loan associations and insurance companies has given a security to savings and investments not heretofore known. The regulation of railroad rates, which not yet satisfactorily worked out, gives to the farmer and the merchant hope of transportation at a fair cost.

HOME RULE IN THE CITIES.

The problem of the cities is always with us. It is the serious and unsolved problem of the age. In those communities where men are crowded together, and life so frequently depends on the day's work, government presents conditions unknown to the freer life of the country districts.

From the city government has come the boss, a product of modern times, and the most difficult character that confronts the statesman dealing with an electorate based on universal suffrage. The Republican platform announces it favors the principle of home rule for the cities, and possibly former Democratic platforms have made similar pronouncements.

I have never agreed with those who would put the police force of a great city wholly under the control of local authorities. The general public divides its vote along lines of political principles. The law breaker and those seeking special favors at the hands of the police will always be able to unite for personal advantage and protection; we cannot afford to make the control of the police force of our cities a prize to be won by such a combination.

Aside from their pride in them, the people of the State have a direct interest in the prosperity and good government of our great cities. They are the markets through which our products must reach the world. They are the marts of trade that furnish us the articles we demand. Their streets are walked by the citizens of every county, and the security of life, and property, and preservation of health in the cities is a matter of direct interest to every community in the State.

These police officials are officers of the State enforcing its laws, as well as the laws of the city, and it is best alike for city and country that some power over them be reserved in the State.

EFFICIENT NON-POLITICAL POLICE FORCE PROMISED.

One thing above all others must be recognized if a police force is to be efficient—it must be kept out of politics. The individual policeman has the same right as any other citizen to his party preference, but on duty he must be a peace officer, and not a partisan. When the force becomes an adjunct of a political machine, both the police and the party are corrupted by the power it wields.

If I am elected Governor of this State, no police force in any city under a board appointed by me will be used to control an election or permitted to exercise its power for the benefit of either party at the polls or any faction at a primary.

HOME RULE A SOP TO ADVOCATES OF SUNDAY SALOON.

I charge here and now that the home rule plank in the Republican platform was put there for a specific purpose, and that purpose was to counteract the promise made in the next lines of the platform, that the saloon should be closed on Sunday. I had supposed the policies of both parties in relation to the liquor traffic had been settled by the previous declarations of the candidates.

At the beginning of the primary campaign, in order that no man might be led into voting for me through any mistake as to where I stood on this proposition, I announced my position through the columns of the St. Louis Republic in the following interview published December 6th, 1907, and widely copied by the newspapers of the State:

COWHERD'S CLEAN OUT DECLARATION

"The office of Governor is an executive office. His duty is to enforce the law, and no man can or ought to be elected Governor of Missouri about whose sincerity of purpose to enforce the law there is any question.

It is true to a certain extent that the successful enforcement of the law depends upon public sentiment. Twenty years ago, or even ten years ago, it would have been very difficult to have closed the saloons in the great cities on Sunday. They are closed today, and ought to be kept closed, and if I am elected Governor, they will be.

I believe in a strict regulation of the liquor traffic, and the laws regulating the saloon ought to be strictly enforced. The states that have made decided progress along temperance lines have not been the prohibition states like Kansas and Maine, but the local option states like Texas, Mississippi, Tennessee and Missouri.

The present local option law has worked very satisfactorily in Missouri. It is a Democratic law, passed by a Democratic Legislature, signed by a Democratic Governor, and it follows Democratic principles. It gives to the local community the right to regulate its own affairs. If the majority of the voters of that community desire prohibition, they can have it, and if the majority desire the licensed saloon, they can have that, but no community can force its own views upon another. This is good Democratic doctrine."

WHAT HADLEY AND DICKEY SAY.

A few months later, in an open letter to Mr. W. S. Dickey, published May 14th, 1908, in the Kansas City Journal, Mr. Hadley likewise defined his position, a part of which I quote: "I am not in favor of state-wide prohibition. I do not believe the cause of temperance or good government would be subserved by the adoption of such an amendment in this State."

He then declares for local option, and concludes:

"I also believe that the laws regulating dramshops and the sale of intoxicating liquors should be vigorously and strictly enforced."

Mr. Hadley does not specifically endorse Sunday closing of the saloons, but he does say the laws regulating the dramshop should be "vigorously and strictly enforced."

DOUBLE DEALING PLATFORM.

After these pronouncements, and after the men making them had become the nominees of their respective parties, we had a right to believe that this question had been removed from the realm of political dispute. But now comes the Republican platform with its home rule plank, deliberately giving to the city the right to annul the power of the State. If those desiring the open saloon on Sunday can by uniting with either of the great political parties elect a board of police commissioners and an excise commissioner favorable to their view, then these officers may disregard violations of that law, and the Governor of the State would be practically powerless to enforce it.

WHERE DOES HADLEY STAND?

We have today a similar situation in St. Louis county. Here local Republican officials are charged with having refused to enforce the law, and at the command of the Governor the Attorney-General is endeavoring to have the courts perform the duty of the local constabulary. This Republican platform is a deliberate piece of double dealing, promising in one plank to the people of the country that the saloons shall be closed, and in the next promising the people of the city they may keep them open. I demand of Mr. Hadley that he either repudiate his home rule plank or admit to the people of the State he does not propose to enforce the law as to the closing of the saloon on Sunday. Is it possible that since the published interview to which I have referred Mr. Hadley's sentiments have changed, or were his views modified to meet the wishes of Mr. Otto Stiefel, a prominent St. Louis brewer, and Mr. Charles Nagel, the national Republican committeeman, general counsel for the greatest brewery in the State, whom we are told by the press helped to shape the issues for this campaign?

Like the platform of their party in the nation, the platform of the Republican party in the State is as noticeable for the things it omits as the things it includes. They denounce the Senatorial primary law, but fail to announce they favor any plan giving to the people the right to elect their Senators by direct vote. Under this Senatorial primary law, democracy has given to the people as nearly as it may be done under the present Constitution of the United States, a direct vote for the election of a Senator, and we favor such change in the Constitution as will give this privilege to the people.

NO MORE LOOTED SCHOOL FUND

The Republicans no longer raise the cry of a looted school fund or bogus school certificates. After four years' possession of the books, they have been compelled to admit that charge was false and libelous, and by their silence they now confess that of the more than \$100,000,000.00 of State funds which have passed through Democratic hands since 1873 not a single dollar was ever lost to the treasury of the State. Were they candid with the public, they would admit the school certificate is as good as the bond of the United States, and that it yearly yields to the school fund three times as much in interest as would be received were those funds now invested in accordance with former Republican demands.

GUARANTEE OF BANK DEPOSITS.

The guaranteeing by the State of deposits in the banks has become a question of absorbing interest. The action of the banks during the recent panic, when they were compelled to suspend the paying out of cash, alarmed the people. The recommendation by the President for the establishment of a Postal Savings Bank system has alarmed the banker. The most important function of the modern bank is to keep the money of the country circulating through the chan-

nels of trade. This can only be done when the depositor has confidence in the soundness of his bank.

Panic is the specter that haunts the waking hours of every business man, and panic is most frequently precipitated by the small depositor losing confidence in the security of his place of deposit. Once imbued with that idea, he rushes to withdraw his money, and we are brought face to face with all the evils of a suddenly restricted currency. To remedy this, the Republican party offers the Emergency Currency Bill of the last Congress, which permits national banks to issue currency based only on their assets, and gives to the government a first lien on those assets to redeem the currency.

Under this plan every issue of additional currency by a bank exhausts its assets, and tends rather to excite than allay the fear of the depositor, so the effort of the bank to meet a pressing need only increases the demand upon its strained resources. The Postal Savings Bank will give security to deposits, but it purchases this relief at the expense of putting the government into the banking business and the individual out; and the funds gathered by the government in these Postal Banks will, if present Republican policies are continued, be concentrated in central places of deposit, and in the end go to swell the volume of Wall Street speculation.

DEMOCRATS OFFER A REMEDY—REPUBLICANS SILENT.

To meet this situation, we propose a state and national guaranty law, under such regulations and restrictions as will insure a conservative banking policy and security of deposits. This of necessity means improved inspection, and will result in each banker becoming a watch over the other. The tax upon the bank will be small, and will be paid many times over in the additional security to the public. Business relieved of the fear of panic will move forward to assured and continuous prosperity.

On this important policy the Republicans of Missouri are ominously silent. They fear to adopt a plan that has not yet met with the approval of the great national bankers, and they fear to oppose a plan offering so much relief to the average citizen. So they pass in silence what they dare neither to oppose nor approve.

Interesting and important as are these questions in regard to State affairs, yet after all it is the policies of the nation that bring prosperity or adversity to the people of the State. If the national government pursues false policies, citizens of every state must suffer for it.

REPUBLICAN NOMINEE QUESTIONED ON NATIONAL PLATFORM.

National issues are a part of this campaign, and we shall not allow Mr. Hadley to avoid them. He was a member of the Convention that nominated the candidates and made the platform; he cannot shirk responsibility for either. If he endorses them, he is not entitled to the vote of a laboring man in the State. If he refuses to endorse them, he will lose the support of his party. He must take one horn or the other of this dilemma, and either will be fatal to his hopes.

Nothing, in my judgment, would more surely promote the general prosperity of Missouri than the building up within her limits of a great manufacturing industry. Every natural resource invites the building here of factories. Our wealth of raw material, our wonderful mineral resources, our central location for purposes of distribution, our salubrious climate, our vast beds of coal, the swift streams of our southern counties waiting to be harnessed, the variety and plenitude of our agricultural products, cheap food, all are invitations to the manufacturer to make this his home. Why does he not accept? Why are so many articles, necessities of our daily life, which could be manufactured out of our raw material, imported from other states and we compelled to pay the cost, both of the transportation of the raw material to the factory, and the finished product to our homes? The answer is the manufacturer already has his money invested in plants in eastern states, and so long as under a protective tariff he can crush out competition by combination, he can compel the customer to pay these additional costs of transportation without reduction of his profit. Already protected from foreign competition by 1500 miles of land and 3000 miles of water, Missouri has everything to gain and nothing to lose by a reduction of duties. Every dollar that we pay beyond what is necessary for government revenues is not only an unjust burden upon our citizens, but a premium to the eastern manufacturer to prevent the upbuilding of Missouri industries.

LOW TAXES, LARGE COMMERCE WANTED.

Taxation and commerce are the two great problems of government, and the duty of statesmanship is to keep one at the lowest and the other at the highest level.

All parties admit that to support the great expense of the national government we must maintain tariff duties. The Republican party contends that in fixing such taxes the purpose should be to protect manufacturers with revenue as an incident thereto. The Democratic party contends that in fixing the tax the purpose should be to raise revenue with protection only as an incident. If the Republican principle prevails, as it does now, the tariff duties are so adjusted as to raise the smallest amount of revenue and furnish the highest amount of protection. In other words, the duties are so adjusted as to give out of the sum paid by the people on account of tariff taxes the smallest possible amount to the general government, and the largest amount to the protected manufacturer. By this policy, manufacturers are at first

stimulated, but the natural result is soon felt in an over supply for the home market, and the manufacturer seeks to sell his surplus abroad. Here he finds he must face retaliatory duties and an unfriendly market, for exchange is the law of international commerce, and no people will long buy from those to whom they cannot sell. So with a limited market unregulated by foreign competition, the manufacturer meets the problem by a combination that limits production and fixes price at a point just below the cost of the foreign article with the tariff added. Thus the protective tariff naturally and inevitably brings forth the trust, and the folly of a party pretending to oppose the trusts and yet advocating a high protective tariff must be apparent to every thinking man.

REPUBLICAN PARTY'S ADMISSION.

This year the Republican party, recognizing the growing sentiment over the country demanding a reduction in tariff schedules, incorporated in its platform a plank intended to deceive the people into believing that it proposes a reduction of tariff duties. Republican promises of tax reduction are not new, but Republican performance along that line would be a novelty to American history.

In 1868 the Republican platform demanded a reduction of taxes, and at various times since then, when pressed by public sentiment, they have made platform pledges of that character. But whenever a Republican Congress touches a tariff bill they always raise the tax. This year, fortunately for the people, that they may understand fully what is meant by this Republican promise of revision, the platform lays down the rule by which the tariff is to be revised. First, it must be high enough to cover the difference between labor cost at home and abroad. This is the old Republican campaign cry, and this the limit heretofore demanded in tariff taxation. But now they have added that the tariff must, in addition to covering the difference in labor cost, be high enough to guarantee a profit to the American manufacturer.

To prove that these words are not mere surplusage, and that they have a meaning, it is only necessary to consider the conduct of the Republican party in convention at Chicago. Before the platform committee a resolution was offered demanding a tariff merely equal to the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad, and it was defeated by a vote of 52 to 1. It was again offered as a minority resolution in the convention, and defeated by a vote of 952 to 58. So here is a distinct and positive change in Republican policies, and an absolute demand that the revision of the tariff shall include a promise of profit to the manufacturer never before included in a party platform. In the light of this pronouncement of the party, we can better understand Mr. Taft's suggestion, that it must be remembered that revision means a raising where taxes are too low, as well as a lowering where the taxes are too high, and we may well believe that should the Republican party be successful in this campaign, this platform will be construed to mean that present schedules are too low, and the readjustment of them will be upward instead of downward.

NOT FAIR TO MERCHANT AND FARMER.

To what other industry or business does the government guarantee a profit? The merchant must purchase his stock of goods and take the chance of a falling market or a lack of trade. The farmer must plant his crop and bestow upon it unremitting toil and take all the chances of unfavorable seasons, of a constantly changing price, and of open competition in the markets of the world. In every line of industry the citizen must run the risk himself, but the Republican party now proposes the government shall guarantee the investment of the manufacturer, and out of the pockets of other citizens shall come the money to make good his profit.

The time has come when, as recognized by President McKinley, our manufacturing industries have reached beyond the limits of the United States, and the needs of our people are not more taxes, but more markets.

It would have been well for the country had his party heeded the wise words spoken by him as he stood on the brink of the grave at Buffalo, and looked with prophetic vision into the future:

"Our capacity to produce," he said, "has developed so enormously and our products have so multiplied that the problem of more markets requires our urgent and immediate attention."

"A system which provides a mutual exchange of commodities is manifestly essential to the continued healthful growth of our export trade. We must not repose in fancied security that we can forever sell everything and buy little or nothing. If such a thing were possible, it would not be best for us or for those with whom we deal. We should take from our customers such of their products as we can use without harm to our industries and labor."

OPEN MARKETS DEMAND.

The enormous balances of trade of which our Republican friends so frequently boast are constituted in large part of agricultural products and raw material. The country would be better off if both were consumed at home. The only hope of restoring our flag to the seas and giving to us that permanent prosperity that should be the constant accompaniment of new and fertile territory is by opening to the industry of our citizens, and to their well known ingenuity and productivity, the markets of the world.

Under a tariff that recognizes the obligation to raise revenue rather than to protect investment, our commerce would be released from the retaliatory duties that foreign countries are now putting upon us, our home mar-

ket would be free from the domination of the destroying trust, wages would be increased and cost of living reduced, and every branch of industry would take on new life and activity.

Nothing has added so greatly to the concentration of wealth in few hands as the operation of the tariff law and the growth of the trusts it has necessarily created. The great distinction between Democracy and Republicanism is this: Whatever mistake Democracy may have made, it has always firmly stood opposed to special privileges, and whatever virtues Republicanism may have possessed, it has always stood for favors to special classes. As long as this great principle stands as the line of differentiation between the parties, there can be no question as to where lies the interest of the masses.

THE TARIFF KEEPS UP THE TRUST.

Never again can the Republican party contend that the removal of the tariff will not destroy the trust. Last year all the great newspapers of the land joined in a demand upon Congress for the removal of the duty on wood pulp, and every Republican editor voiced the assertion that this removal of duty would break up the print paper trust, and relieve him from the grievous exactions it imposed. Will those Republican editors now deny to the farmer the relief they demanded for themselves? Will they pretend that the remedy so efficacious in their behalf would be of no value to him? The sauce for the editorial goose will surely make good dressing for the agricultural gander.

In the attempt to control the trust under laws that have encouraged it, the Republican party has year after year wandered farther from the principles on which the government was founded, until today they are threatening to attack the integrity of the states, in order that the general government may have sufficient power to crush this creature of its own breeding. We demand that the rights of the states be preserved, and that the power of the general government be used only to supplement the power of the states.

HADLEY BACKS DOWN ON FEDERAL COURTS.

Some months ago, if one might judge from the utterances accredited to him by the press, Mr. Hadley was very much inclined to this Democratic doctrine, but now that his party has announced its policy, we hear nothing more from him along that line. If he believes in this preservation of the states' rights, and honesty desires to see it put in force, he should announce his preference for the election of a Democratic Legislature that will send to the Senate of the United States a man in harmony with this great principle, and the election of Democratic Congressmen to maintain it in the popular branch of the Federal assembly. But perhaps Mr. Hadley has seen a new light upon this issue, as he has on other questions. We were told through the columns of the Missouri press just before the gathering of the convention at Chicago that Mr. Hadley was on his way to that great body armed with a resolution demanding that the Federal courts no longer usurp the jurisdiction of the states, and that the cause of men who labored be protected from the too liberal use of the injunctive process. We were told that the Missouri delegation had already decided he should be its member on the platform committee in order that he might press these resolutions, but when Chicago was reached, and Mr. Hadley had opportunity to confer with the leaders of his party, we were informed he would yield his place on the platform committee to Senator Warner, and when the time approached for a discussion of these issues on the floor, his place was taken by Nelson Crews, his colored alternate from Kansas City.

ALSO GIVES LABOR THE COLD SHOULDER.

The Chicago convention not only refused the demands made by the labor leaders, but proposed to give the force of statutory law to the present procedure in the Federal courts, and since then we have heard nothing more of Mr. Hadley's plank, but only of his approval of the Republican policy.

Under the Sherman anti-trust law, as construed today by our courts, the labor union is a twin brother to the criminal trust. In the last Congress labor begged of the Republican party to be relieved from this odium. Not only was their request denied, but in boastful language the Republican leaders announced they were responsible for legislation. For years the Republican party has refused every reasonable demand of labor; and yet with full knowledge of that fact the votes of laboring men have maintained in Congress a Republican majority. Has that majority not a right therefore to believe that those men approve their course? It is the sheerest folly for a laboring man to pretend he favors the bills proposed by the American Federation of Labor, and then go to the polls and vote for a Republican Congressman.

He knows full well whatever may be the pledges that Republican Congressmen make; he will at Washington enter the caucus of his party; that caucus will again choose Uncle Joe Cannon as Speaker of the House, and Uncle Joe, if elected, will appoint a committee that will never permit a labor measure to come before that body. So every laboring man should realize in this campaign that when he votes for a Republican Congressman he votes for the perpetuation of the present procedure in injunction cases, and against the right of jury trial in cases of indirect contempt, and for retaining on the statute books the law that makes a labor union a criminal trust, and every member of it liable to fine and imprisonment.

THE PANIC A THORN IN THE SIDE.

For many years it has been the slogan of the Republican party that Democratic success meant financial depression.

For years they have led the people to believe that under Republican rule and a high protective tariff the country would always enjoy prosperity. Last fall, under the highest protective tariff that was ever known, with enormous republican majorities in House and Senate, and a strenuous republican executive in the White House, the country was compelled to face a severe financial depression. The stringency of 1892 was world-wide in its scope, and the panic swept over many foreign lands before it visited America, proving conclusively that the conditions which brought it on were not of local origin. This year no country was visited by panic except the United States, proving conclusively it was local and not world-wide conditions that caused the trouble. For twelve years the Republican party has controlled every branch of the government. They have made the laws and administered them. What excuse have they to offer for the conditions that they brought about? If, as a portion of that party contends, this panic was deliberately brought upon the country by a few great financiers, what excuse can the party give for a governmental policy under which a few great financiers can at will wreck the business interest of 80,000,000 freemen? If, as another portion of the party contends, this panic was brought upon the country by the over-zealousness of the chief executive along certain lines, it is only an assertion that the business men of the country have lost confidence in Republican policies, administered by a Republican President.

We of the middle west suffered probably less than any other section of the country. Abundant crops from our fertile fields and the prosperity of our agricultural communities was the cause of our security. Already our Republican friends are proclaiming that prosperity has returned. We trust that this is true, but we cannot refrain from observing here and there a discordant note.

REPUBLICANS ATTEST THE SEVERITY OF BUSINESS DEPRESSION.

A recent Republican Secretary of the Treasury has said: "The stringency of 1907 is generally conceded to have been the severest the world has ever witnessed." And on August 29th last, at Centerville, Iowa, Mr. Shonts, president of a great railroad system, the man selected by Mr. Roosevelt as the one best fitted to perform the greatest task of the century, the building of the Isthmian Canal, made the following statement:

"We have before us an illustration of what even a temporary cessation of the transportation development of the country means. A year ago there were 1,675,000 railroad employees in active service, and they received nearly \$1,000,000,000 in wages during the year, according to statistics collected by the government. Fully one-quarter of these men are now idle at a loss in wages approximating \$1,000,000 for every working day. A year ago the railroads were spending \$1,250,000,000 for supplies; now they are spending not more than \$500,000,000. This means a falling off in railroad expenditures of \$3,000,000 a day, and it is impossible to accurately state the number of men in forests, mines and factories who have been thrown out of employment by the shrinkage of the demand for equipment and supplies, but they are numbered by the tens of thousands."

If this be true as to a single industry, we may well imagine that were the facts known as to the entire country, the nation would be shocked at the disclosures.

Mr. Samuel Gompers estimates that 2,000,000 men today are seeking jobs. The closed shop and the open soup house are this year threatening Republican supremacy, instead of furnishing the climax for Republicanatory.

STRONG WORDS FOR FELLOW NOMINEES.

Hastily and imperfectly I have attempted to trace the issues of this campaign. In conclusion, I wish to say for my associates upon this ticket, that democracy has never presented better men to the voters of the State. They are each and all gentlemen of the highest character, able to worthily fill the positions for which they have been chosen.

Supported by such a ticket, relying upon the justness of our cause and the intelligence of the constituency to which we appeal, we go forth to meet the enemy confident of victory.

BRILLIANT TRIBUTE TO W. J. BRYAN.

We go with all the greater confidence because we follow the leadership of one whose like has rarely been seen in this or any other land. Twice defeated for the high office of President, relegated by his enemies to obscurity, with the boast that never again would he be able to attract passing comment in a news column, he stands today the foremost citizen of the greatest nation on earth. Without the power of patronage or wealth, by the mere force of his genius and the dynamic power of being right, he has shaped the policies of the country. He forced his victorious adversaries to abandon the platform on which they had been successful and adopt the principles of those whom they defeated. Today, without regard to party affiliation, eighty million people revere him as the model citizen of the republic; a man of the loftiest character and a patriot of purest purpose.

He is, I confidently believe, the best beloved man that walks the globe. From the hearts of all who love liberty and hate oppression, there is going up today a prayer that will swell into a psalm of thanksgiving when the wires next November carry to every hamlet the glad tidings that William J. Bryan has been elected President of the United States.